

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 are now in the application. Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 are subject to examination. Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 have been amended. Claims 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 28-61 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 because of an informality. The Examiner suggested that "a axial" be changed to "an axial".

Applicants appreciate the indication of the informality. The limitation, which previously appeared in claim 17, has been changed in accordance with the Examiner's suggested correction. The changed limitation now appears in claims 18 and 19.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 17, 21, and 25 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,915,673 to Tamai et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,832,709 to Nagyszalanczy and U.S. Patent No. 4,092,130 to Wikdahl under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 17, 21, and 25 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 9 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 20, 24, and 28 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,915,673 to Tamai et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,832,709 to Nagyszalanczy and U.S. Patent No. 4,092,130 to Wikdahl and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,716,269 to Graff et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 20, 24, and 28 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's statement that claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Even though the previous limitations in claims 18, 22 and 26 have been slightly reworded in order to properly refer to the flow channels, which had already been introduced, all of the claimed features are indeed in these claims. Claim 18, for example, includes a feature (1): carrying the process fluid with a

constant flow cross section in a centrifuged state in the double tube in flow channels in the area of the double-walled centrifuge rotor remote from the axis. The changed feature (2): "wherein the flow channels are formed between webs extending parallel to the axis, in the double-walled centrifuge rotor", refers to the previously flow channels. Limitation (2) in combination with limitation (1) includes all of the limitations of the corresponding previous limitation of claim 18, namely "carrying the process fluid in flow channels formed between webs extending parallel to the axis, in the double-walled centrifuge rotor". Similar reasoning applies to claims 22 and 26.

Applicants believe it is clear that the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, do not show or suggest the features of claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, or 27.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

An additional fee for the added independent claims is not required since a corresponding number of independent claims have been canceled.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

March 19, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101